

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to an Office Action mailed 06/15/2006, in which, the Examiner said that claims 1-18 were pending, that claims 1, 7-11, and 15-18 were rejected, and that claims 2-5 and 12-16 were objected to.

Claims Rejected under 34 USC §112

In the above-mentioned Office Action, the Examiner said that claims 8, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner said that, on lines 4-6, there is no clear antecedent basis for "said first indicator light." In this amendment, this wording is changed to "said drive indicator light," for which antecedent basis is provided in claim 7, line 2.

Regarding claims 10 and 18, the Examiner additionally said that, there was no clear antecedent basis for "a second light indicator" because there was no first light indicator. In this amendment, this wording is changed to "a power indicator light." Support for this change is found in the specification as originally filed on page 6, lines 11-15.

Claims Rejected under 35 USC §102

The Examiner further said that claims 1, 9, 11, and 17 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,883,048 to Suwa et al.

Regarding claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that Suwa et al. does not anticipate the requirement of this claim for the peripheral device to include a peripheral power supply system performing a process of supplying at least one voltage level to components within the peripheral device, and for the main power

switch to turn both the power supply of the system unit and the power supply of the peripheral device.

As described in column 3, lines 10-17, the LCD unit of Suwa et al. includes a power switch 4d that causes the notebook computer 1 to be turned on and activated, making another LCD device additionally operable. There is no mention of either LCD unit having its own power supply, and there is no implied need for such a separate power supply. There is no mention in Suwa et al. that the LCD unit should be operable except as connected to the notebook computer. Since there is no need for a separate peripheral power supply, the apparatus of Suwa et al. appears to have a single power supply, with signals being developed within the notebook computer to drive the LCD screens. On the other hand, the display unit of the Applicants' invention has its own power supply, allowing it to be used with another type of computer system. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over Suwa et al.

Regarding claim 9, since this dependent claim merely adds its limitations to those of claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is patentable over Suwa et al. for reasons described above regarding claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, the Applicants respectfully submit that Suwa et al. fails to anticipate the requirement of this claim for the peripheral device to include a power supply system performing a process of supplying at least one voltage level to components within the peripheral device and for the power switch to turn the process of supplying at least one voltage level to components within the peripheral device on and off.

As described in column 3, lines 10-17, the LCD unit of Suwa et al. includes a power switch 4d that causes the notebook computer 1 to be turned on and

activated, making another LCD device additionally operable. There is no mention of either LCD unit having its own power supply, and there is no implied need for such a separate power supply. There is no mention in Suwa et al. that the LCD unit should be operable except as connected to the notebook computer. Since there is no need for a separate peripheral power supply, the apparatus of Suwa et al. appears to have a single power supply, with signals being developed within the notebook computer to drive the LCD screens. On the other hand, the display unit of the Applicants' invention has its own power supply, allowing it to be used with another type of computer system. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable under 35 USC 102(e) over Suwa et al.

Regarding claim 17, since this dependent claim merely adds its limitations to those of claim 11, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is patentable over Suwa et al. for reasons described above regarding claim 11.

Claims Rejected under 35 USC §103

The Examiner also said that claims 7, 10, and 16 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being unpatentable over Suwa et al. in view of Pariza et al., which is cited to show the concept of using a hard disk and a drive light indication for indicating the status of the disk drive and of the processing unit.

Regarding claims 7 and 10, the Applicants respectfully submit that Suwa et al. and Pariza et al., taken in combination fail to teach, disclose, or otherwise anticipate the requirement of claim 1, from which claims 7 and 10 depend, for a main power switch electrically connected to a peripheral power supply in the peripheral device and to the system through the electrical connection to turn both of the power supply systems on and off. As previously described regarding the rejection of claim 1, Suwa fails to describe a system having a separate peripheral power supply. Additionally, Pariza et al., while describing the use of

an indicator light, does not describe a switch on the peripheral unit turning off power within the system unit. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 10 are patentable over Suva et al. in view of Pariza et al.

Regarding claim 18, the Applicants respectfully submit that Suva et al. and Pariza et al., taken in combination fail to teach, disclose, or otherwise anticipate the requirement of claim 11, from which claim 16 depends, for the peripheral device to include a power switch electrically connected to the power supply system of the peripheral unit by a first power switching line to turn the process of supplying a voltage within the peripheral device on and off. As previously described regarding the rejection of claim 1, Suva fails to describe a system having a separate peripheral power supply. Additionally, Pariza et al., while describing the use of an indicator light, does not describe a switch on the peripheral unit turning off power within the system unit. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is patentable over Suva et al. in view of Pariza et al

The Examiner additionally said that claims 8 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suva et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,936,772 to Welch, which is cited to show the concept of a light indicator having a window and a mask.

Regarding claim 8, the Applicants respectfully submit that Suva et al and Welch, taken in combination, fail to teach, disclose, or otherwise anticipate the requirement of claim 1, from which claim 8 depends for the peripheral device to include a peripheral power supply system performing a process of supplying at least one voltage level to components within the peripheral device, and for the main power switch to turn both the power supply of the system unit and the power supply of the peripheral device.

As described in column 3, lines 10-17, the LCD unit of Suwa et al. includes a power switch 4d that causes the notebook computer 1 to be turned on and activated, making another LCD device additionally operable. There is no mention of either LCD unit having its own power supply, and there is no implied need for such a separate power supply. There is no mention in Suwa et al. that the LCD unit should be operable except as connected to the notebook computer. Since there is no need for a separate peripheral power supply, the apparatus of Suwa et al. appears to have a single power supply, with signals being developed within the notebook computer to drive the LCD screens. On the other hand, the display unit of the Applicants' invention has its own power supply, allowing it to be used with another type of computer system. Adding the teachings of Welch to those of Suwa et al. does not resolve this deficiency in describing the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Suwa et al. in view of Welch.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, the Applicants respectfully submit that Suwa et al. fails to anticipate the requirement of claim 11, from which these claims depend, for the peripheral device to include a power supply system performing a process of supplying at least one voltage level to components within the peripheral device and for the power switch to turn the process of supplying at least one voltage level to components within the peripheral device on and off.

As described in column 3, lines 10-17, the LCD unit of Suwa et al. includes a power switch 4d that causes the notebook computer 1 to be turned on and activated, making another LCD device additionally operable. There is no mention of either LCD unit having its own power supply, and there is no implied need for such a separate power supply. There is no mention in Suwa et al. that the LCD unit should be operable except as connected to the notebook computer. Since there is no need for a separate peripheral power supply, the apparatus of Suwa et al. appears to have a single power supply, with signals being developed

within the notebook computer to drive the LCD screens. On the other hand, the display unit of the Applicants' invention has its own power supply, allowing it to be used with another type of computer system. Adding the teachings of Welch to those of Suva et al. does not resolve this deficiency in describing the limitations of claim 11. in view of Welch.

Claims to which Objections were Made

The Examiner said that claims 2-6 and 12-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and of intervening claims. In this amendment, this has been done, with claim 2 being rewritten to include all the limitations of claim 1, and with claim 12 being rewritten to include all of the limitations of claim 11. It is understood that this amendment of claim 2 renders claims 3-6, which depend upon claim 2, allowable, and that this amendment of claim 12 renders claims 13 and 14, which depend upon claim 12.

New Claims

In this amendment, new claims 19 and 20 are added, having all of the limitations of claims 7 and 8, respectively, as being dependent upon claim 2 instead of upon claim 1. Since the Examiner has indicated that claim 2, as rewritten herein, is allowable, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19 and 20 are allowable.

Conclusions

The Applicants respectfully submit that the application, including claims 1-20 is now in condition for allowance, and that action is respectfully requested, with reconsideration and withdrawal of all reasons given for objections and rejections.

Respectfully Submitted,



Ronald V. Davidge

Registration No. 33,863

Telephone No. 954-344-9880

September 15, 2006